

Appendix table 7-1.

Level of public interest in selected policy issues: 1979–2001

(Percentages)

Issue	1979			1981			1983			1985			1988			1990			1992			1995			1997			1999			2001		
	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI
New medical discoveries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	68	29	3	72	25	3	68	29	3	66	31	3	69	27	4	70	26	4	68	28	4	65	32	4
Local schools	38	37	25	46	36	18	46	36	18	47	39	13	51	33	15	50	34	16	53	35	12	57	31	13	58	30	11	54	34	12	59	31	10
Environmental pollution	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	64	31	5	59	36	5	53	41	6	52	40	8	51	41	8	48	43	8
New scientific discoveries	36	49	14	37	45	17	48	40	11	44	44	12	43	46	12	39	48	12	36	49	15	44	45	11	49	42	8	45	43	11	47	45	9
Economy and business conditions	35	48	17	52	37	10	57	33	10	48	41	11	48	42	10	50	40	10	56	36	8	47	42	11	47	42	11	42	45	13	45	45	10
New inventions and technologies	33	51	15	33	50	16	42	45	12	39	49	12	40	48	12	39	49	12	37	53	10	43	46	11	47	43	10	41	48	10	43	47	10
Military and defense policy	—	—	—	—	—	—	43	42	15	47	42	11	47	42	11	55	35	10	47	43	10	37	46	17	35	48	17	42	44	14	38	44	18
Agriculture and farming	23	49	28	24	47	28	—	—	—	30	48	22	40	45	15	24	48	28	—	—	—	21	53	26	24	50	26	22	50	28	29	46	25
International and foreign policy	22	53	24	35	47	18	30	47	22	33	51	16	33	50	16	48	40	12	38	47	15	21	53	26	22	50	28	30	47	23	28	49	23
Space exploration	—	—	—	25	44	31	27	45	28	29	46	25	34	44	22	26	48	26	22	50	28	25	49	26	32	45	22	28	46	25	26	47	27
Sample size (number)	1,635			3,195			1,631			2,005			2,041			2,033			2,001			2,006			2,000			1,882			1,574		

— = not asked; VI = very interested; MI = moderately interested; NI = not interested

NOTES: Respondents were read the following statement: "There are a lot of issues in the news, and it is hard to keep up with every area. I'm going to read you a short list of issues, and for each one—as I read it—I would like you to tell me if you are very interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested." "Don't know" responses are not included. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-2.

Level of public interest in selected policy issues: 1979–2001

(Mean index scores)

Issue	1979	1981	1983	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
New medical discoveries	—	—	—	83	85	83	82	83	83	82	80
Local schools	57	64	64	67	68	67	71	72	73	71	74
Environmental pollution	—	—	—	—	—	80	77	74	72	71	70
New scientific discoveries	61	60	68	66	66	63	61	67	70	67	69
Economy and business conditions	59	71	74	69	69	70	74	68	68	65	67
New inventions and technologies	59	58	65	64	64	64	64	66	69	65	66
Military and defense policy	—	—	64	68	70	73	68	60	59	64	60
International and foreign policy	49	59	54	59	58	68	62	48	47	53	53
Agriculture and farming	48	48	—	54	63	48	—	47	49	47	52
Space exploration	—	47	50	52	56	50	47	50	55	51	50
Sample size (number)	1,635	3,195	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	2,001	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574

— = not asked

NOTES: Respondents were read the following statement: "There are a lot of issues in the news, and it is hard to keep up with every area. I'm going to read you a short list of issues, and for each one—as I read it—I would like you to tell me if you are very interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested." Responses were converted to a 0–100 scale by assigning a value of 100 for a "very interested" response, 50 for "moderately interested," and 0 for "not at all interested." Indices were obtained by adding all the values for each policy issue and computing the average.

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-1 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-3.

Level of public interest in selected policy issues, by sex and level of education: 2001

(Mean index scores)

Sex and level of education	New medical discoveries	Local school issues	Environmental pollution	Issues about new scientific discoveries	Economic issues and business conditions	Use of new inventions and technologies	Military and defense policy	International and foreign policy issues	Agricultural and farm issues	Space exploration	Sample size (number)
All adults	80	74	70	69	67	66	60	53	52	50	1,574
Male	75	69	69	72	71	71	66	58	54	57	751
Female	86	79	71	67	64	62	55	48	51	43	823
Formal education											
Less than high school	73	77	67	57	53	54	56	39	52	39	116
High school graduate	82	74	70	70	69	67	62	53	53	50	834
Baccalaureate degree	81	74	71	75	74	72	60	62	49	57	393
Graduate/professional degree	82	72	75	78	75	74	60	68	49	56	221
Science/mathematics education level^a											
Low	80	75	71	65	65	62	62	48	56	44	674
Middle	81	75	66	71	70	68	58	56	47	52	469
High	81	71	73	78	70	75	60	61	49	61	431

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

NOTES: Respondents were read the following statement: “There are a lot of issues in the news, and it is hard to keep up with every area. I’m going to read you a short list of issues, and for each one—as I read it—I would like you to tell me if you are very interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested.” Responses were converted to a 0–100 scale by assigning value of 100 for a “very interested” response, 50 for “moderately interested,” and 0 for “not at all interested.” Indices were obtained by adding all values for each policy issue and computing the average.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-2 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-4.

Feeling informed about selected policy issues: 1979–2001 (selected years)

(Percentages)

Issue	1979			1981			1983			1985			1988			1990			1992			1995			1997			1999			2001		
	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI	VI	MI	NI
Local school issues	20	48	32	32	45	22	34	41	25	30	47	22	33	44	23	32	46	21	32	46	22	36	46	18	38	44	17	35	47	18	35	48	17
Economic issues and business conditions	14	55	31	29	51	20	28	52	20	22	51	26	22	55	22	25	55	20	29	54	17	25	53	22	25	51	24	23	53	24	23	56	22
New medical discoveries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24	57	18	22	59	19	24	57	20	22	58	21	23	57	20	28	56	16	25	56	19	21	59	20
Environmental pollution	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	55	13	29	56	15	24	56	20	23	55	21	21	54	25	18	58	24
Military and defense policy	—	—	—	—	—	—	21	50	29	21	48	31	17	51	32	26	51	23	24	51	25	17	47	36	18	42	40	21	46	33	15	48	37
Issues about new scientific discoveries	10	52	37	13	49	38	13	53	34	13	59	27	14	55	31	14	55	31	12	54	34	13	58	29	19	58	23	17	56	28	14	57	29
Agricultural and farm issues ...	10	44	45	14	42	44	—	—	—	17	47	35	20	52	27	13	46	42	—	—	—	11	47	42	13	49	38	11	43	45	14	44	43
The use of new inventions and technologies	10	50	39	11	48	40	14	55	32	12	54	34	12	51	36	11	53	35	10	56	33	12	55	33	16	56	28	17	53	30	12	52	36
International and foreign policy issues	8	54	37	17	54	28	14	51	35	15	53	32	14	55	31	22	57	22	19	54	26	10	52	37	10	52	38	14	52	34	12	46	43
Space exploration	—	—	—	14	46	40	13	52	34	16	52	32	13	52	34	11	51	38	9	48	44	9	48	43	16	50	34	13	48	40	10	45	46
Sample size (number)	1,635			3,195			1,631			2,005			2,041			2,033			2,001			2,006			2,000			1,882			1,574		

VI = very well informed; MI = moderately well informed; NI = poorly informed; — = not asked

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. “Don’t know” responses are not included. Responses are to the following statement: Now I’d like to go through this list with you again, and for each issue I’d like you to tell me if you are very well informed, moderately well informed, or poorly informed.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-5.

Feeling informed about selected policy issues: 1979–2001

(Mean index scores)

Issue	1979	1981	1983	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Local school issues	44	55	54	54	55	55	55	59	61	58	59
Economic issues and business conditions	42	55	54	48	50	53	56	52	51	50	51
New medical discoveries	—	—	—	53	52	53	51	52	56	53	51
Environmental pollution	—	—	—	—	—	60	57	52	51	48	47
Issues about new scientific discoveries	36	38	40	43	42	42	39	42	48	44	42
Military and defense policy	—	—	46	45	43	51	49	40	39	44	39
The use of new inventions and technologies	35	35	42	39	38	38	38	40	44	43	38
Agricultural and farm issues	33	35	—	41	46	36	—	35	38	33	35
International and foreign policy issues	35	44	40	42	42	51	46	36	36	40	35
Space exploration	—	37	39	42	39	37	33	33	41	37	32
Sample size (number)	1,635	3,195	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	2,001	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574

— = not asked

NOTES: Respondents were read the following statement: “Now, I’d like to go through this list with you again, and for each issue I’d like you to tell me if you are very well informed, moderately well informed, or poorly informed.” Responses were converted to a 0–100 scale by assigning a value of 100 for a “very well informed” response, 50 for “moderately well informed,” and 0 for “poorly informed.” Indices were obtained by adding all the values for each policy issue and computing the average.

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-1 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-6.

Feeling informed about selected policy issues, by sex and level of education: 2001

(Mean index scores)

Sex and level of education	Local school issues	New medical discoveries	Economic issues and business conditions	Environmental pollution	Issues about new scientific discoveries	Military and defense policy	Use of new inventions and technologies	Agricultural and farming issues	International and foreign policy issues	Space exploration	Sample size (number)
All adults	59	51	51	47	42	39	38	35	35	32	1,574
Male	54	47	55	46	44	44	40	36	38	39	751
Female	64	54	46	48	40	34	37	35	31	26	823
Formal education											
Less than high school	57	45	38	45	33	32	31	38	30	26	116
High school graduate	60	52	51	47	41	40	38	37	33	32	834
Baccalaureate degree	59	50	59	48	49	40	43	29	40	37	393
Graduate/professional degree	61	54	58	53	57	39	49	28	48	38	221
Science/mathematics education^a											
Low	59	50	46	46	37	36	34	39	31	29	674
Middle	61	51	55	48	45	42	40	33	37	31	469
High	58	52	56	49	52	41	47	30	40	41	431

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

NOTES: Respondents were read the following statement: "Now, I'd like to go through this list with you again, and for each issue I'd like you to tell me if you are very well informed, moderately well informed, or poorly informed." Responses were converted to a 0–100 scale by assigning a value of 100 for a "very well informed" response, 50 for "moderately well informed," and 0 for "poorly informed." Indices were obtained by adding all the values for each policy issue and computing the average.

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-2 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-7.
Public attentiveness to selected policy issues: 1979–2001
 (Percentages)

Issue	1979			1981			1983			1985			1988			1990			1992			1995			1997			1999			2001		
	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP	AP	IP	RP
Local schools	17	21	62	27	19	54	27	20	54	26	22	52	31	20	49	28	23	49	26	25	49	32	25	43	33	25	42	29	25	46	31	28	41
International and foreign policy issues	6	16	78	6	29	65	8	23	70	8	25	67	8	25	67	14	34	52	11	27	62	5	16	79	5	18	77	7	23	70	5	23	72
Issues about new scientific discoveries	7	29	64	9	28	63	9	40	52	8	36	56	8	34	57	8	31	61	7	29	64	7	37	56	11	38	51	8	37	55	7	39	53
The use of new inventions and technologies	6	27	67	8	26	67	8	34	58	8	31	61	7	33	60	7	32	61	6	30	63	6	37	57	9	38	53	7	34	59	6	36	58
Science and technology ^a	9	37	54	12	35	54	13	48	39	12	44	45	11	42	46	11	40	49	10	40	50	10	47	43	14	46	40	12	44	44	10	48	42
Space exploration	—	—	—	7	18	75	7	20	73	9	20	71	8	26	66	6	20	74	5	17	78	5	20	75	8	24	68	6	22	72	5	21	74
New medical discoveries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	51	32	16	56	28	16	52	32	17	49	34	16	53	31	19	52	29	16	52	32	14	51	35
Environmental pollution	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	43	36	18	41	41	12	40	48	12	40	48	10	41	49	10	38	52
Economic issues and business conditions	9	26	65	12	40	48	19	38	43	16	32	52	15	33	52	17	34	50	19	38	44	15	32	53	14	32	54	12	30	58	12	33	55
Agriculture	5	18	77	3	21	76	—	—	—	9	21	70	9	31	60	6	18	76	—	—	—	5	16	79	5	18	77	6	16	78	6	23	71
Military and defense	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	29	57	13	34	53	16	56	28	16	39	45	16	31	53	8	29	63	9	26	65	10	32	58	7	31	62
Sample size (number)	1,635			3,195			1,631			2,005			2,041			2,033			2,001			2,006			2,000			1,882			1,574		

AP = attentive public; IP = interested public; RP = residual public; — = not asked

^aThe attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. To be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue area. Responses are to the following statements:

—There are a lot of issues in the news, and it is hard to keep up with every area. I’m going to read to you a short list of issues, and for each one—as I read it—I would like you to tell me if you are interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested.

—Now I’d like to go through this list with you again, and for each issue I’d like you to tell me if you are very well informed, moderately well informed, or poorly informed.

—Now let me change the topic slightly and ask you how you get information. First, how often do you read a newspaper: every day, a few times a week, once a week, or less than once a week? Is there any magazine that you read regularly, that is, most of the time? What magazine would that be? Is there another magazine that you read regularly? What magazine would that be?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-8.
Public attentiveness to science and technology issues, by sex and level of education: 2001
 (Percentages)

Sex and level of education	New scientific discoveries		New inventions and technologies		Science and technology ^a		New medical discoveries		Space exploration		Environmental pollution		Sample size (number)
	AP	IP	AP	IP	AP	IP	AP	IP	AP	IP	AP	IP	
All adults	7	39	6	36	10	48	14	51	5	21	10	38	1,574
Male	10	41	9	41	13	50	11	44	8	28	11	36	751
Female	5	37	4	31	8	46	17	57	2	14	10	40	823
Formal education													
Less than high school	3	34	2	29	3	40	7	52	0	24	6	39	116
High school graduate	6	40	6	36	10	50	15	51	6	19	10	38	834
Baccalaureate degree	11	41	8	39	13	49	14	50	7	25	11	36	393
Graduate/professional degree	18	41	11	41	23	44	20	48	8	18	17	38	221
Science/mathematics education^b													
Low	5	36	4	33	7	45	12	52	2	20	9	41	674
Middle	8	42	8	39	12	51	15	49	6	20	12	32	469
High	15	42	10	41	18	50	17	48	11	26	13	38	431

AP = attentive public; IP = interested public

^aThe attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of these issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of these issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

^bRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

NOTES: To be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, that he or she is "very well informed" about it, and that he or she is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statements:

—There are a lot of issues in the news, and it is hard to keep up with every area. I'm going to read you a short list of issues, and for each one—as I read it—I would like you to tell me if you are interested, moderately interested, or not at all interested.

—Now, I'd like to go through this list with you again, and for each issue, I'd like you to tell me if you are very well informed, moderately well informed, or poorly informed.

—How often do you read a newspaper: every day, a few times a week, once a week, or less than once a week? Is there any magazine that you read regularly, that is, most of the time? What magazine would that be? Is there another magazine that you read regularly? What magazine would that be?"

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-3 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-9.

Correct answers to scientific terms and concept questions: 1995–2001
(Aggregated percentages)

Characteristic	1995	1997	1999	2001
All adults	63	61	62	64
Male	69	67	67	70
Female	58	56	58	59
Formal education				
Less than high school	45	48	48	50
High school graduate	60	61	62	63
Baccalaureate	72	73	75	77
Graduate/professional	81	79	80	80
Science/mathematics education^a				
Low	53	53	54	56
Middle	67	65	68	68
High	78	79	79	81
Attentiveness to science or technology^b				
Attentive public	74	71	72	73
Interested public	65	64	65	67
Residual public	56	54	56	59

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue area. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of these issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology

NOTES: This measure includes responses to the following true/false questions:

- All radioactivity is man-made. (False)
- Electrons are smaller than atoms. (True)
- The continents on which we live have been moving their location for millions of years and will continue to move in the future. (True)
- The earliest humans lived at the same time as the dinosaurs. (False)
- The center of the Earth is hot. (True)
- The oxygen we breathe comes from plants. (True)
- It is the father's gene that decides whether the baby is a boy or a girl. (True)
- Lasers work by focusing sound waves. (False)
- Antibiotics kill viruses as well as bacteria. (False)
- The universe began with a huge explosion. (True)
- Human beings, as we know them today, developed from earlier species of animals. (True)
- Cigarette smoking causes lung cancer. (True)
- Radioactive milk can be made safe by boiling it. (False)

The following short-answer items were also included:

- Which travels faster: light or sound? (Light)
- Does the Earth go around the Sun, or does the Sun go around the Earth? (Earth around the Sun)
- How long does it take for the Earth to go around the Sun: one day, one month, or one year? (One year)

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-10.

Correct answers to specific science literacy questions: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	Sample size (number)
All adults	80	76	87	65	45	48	51	33	79	53	94	48	65	76	75	54	45	22	1,574
Male	85	81	92	58	61	52	46	43	83	57	94	50	70	89	86	66	47	28	751
Female	76	71	82	72	30	43	55	24	74	50	93	45	60	65	66	42	44	15	823
Formal education																			
Less than high school	71	61	79	45	32	29	25	20	62	45	95	36	52	61	52	31	28	27	116
High school graduate	79	75	88	66	41	45	49	32	79	49	92	46	63	78	76	51	38	17	834
Baccalaureate	90	92	88	77	65	66	73	44	89	67	96	58	78	85	92	77	69	28	393
Graduate/professional	92	86	89	76	65	70	76	59	90	81	95	67	80	82	92	76	68	37	221
Science/mathematics education^a																			
Low	73	67	55	59	33	33	39	25	72	46	92	40	60	71	65	39	28	10	674
Middle	86	80	58	69	49	56	57	38	82	56	95	53	64	79	92	61	54	23	469
High	92	92	91	77	71	77	76	50	91	69	96	62	80	89	94	83	70	37	431
Attentiveness to science or technology^b	76	71	82	72	30	43	55	24	74	50	93	45	60	65	66	42	44	15	823
Attentive public	88	80	89	68	58	57	56	50	90	72	93	61	78	82	83	66	50	28	195
Interested public	83	79	88	67	47	51	57	39	81	53	94	48	65	80	81	58	48	22	755
Residual public	76	71	84	62	39	42	43	24	73	49	93	44	62	71	68	46	41	19	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of these issues but is a member of the interested public for at least one of these issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are correct for the following statements:

A = The center of the Earth is very hot. (True)

B = All radioactivity is man-made. (False)

C = The oxygen we breathe comes from plants. (True)

D = It is the father's gene which decides whether the baby is a boy or a girl. (True)

E = Lasers work by focusing sound waves. (False)

F = Electrons are smaller than atoms. (True)

G = Antibiotics kill viruses as well as bacteria. (False)

H = The universe began with a huge explosion. (True)

I = The continents on which we live have been moving their location for millions of years and will continue to move in the future. (True)

J = Human beings, as we know them today, developed from earlier species of animals. (True)

K = Cigarette smoking causes lung cancer. (True)

L = The earliest humans lived at the same time as the dinosaurs. (False)

M = Radioactive milk can be made safe by boiling it. (False)

N = Which travels faster: light or sound? (Light)

O = Does the Earth go around the Sun, or does the Sun go around the Earth? (Earth around the Sun)

P = How long does it take for the Earth to go around the Sun: one day, one month, or one year? (One year)

Appendix table 7-10.
Correct answers to specific science literacy questions: 2001
(Percentages)

Q = Please tell me in your own words, what is DNA?
R = Please tell me in your own words, what is a molecule?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.
See Figure 7-4 in volume 1.

Page 2 of 2

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-11.

Public understanding of the nature of scientific inquiry: 2001

Characteristic	Inquiry	Scientific study	Experiment	Probability
All adults	30	33	43	57
Male	30	33	44	58
Female	29	33	43	56
Formal education				
Less than high school	10	24	26	32
High school graduate	28	26	41	59
Baccalaureate	45	52	58	70
Graduate/professional	54	59	67	76
Science/mathematics education^a				
Low	17	19	29	47
Middle	38	39	54	63
High	53	55	64	77
Attentiveness to science and technology^b				
Attentive public	35	33	43	63
Interested public	32	34	45	58
Residual public	26	32	41	55

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of these issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of these issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology

NOTES: The level of understanding of the nature of scientific inquiry is estimated using a combination of each survey participant's responses to three questions. To be classified as understanding the nature of scientific inquiry, a respondent had to answer all the probability questions correctly and either provide a "theory-testing" response to the question about what it means to study something scientifically or provide a correct response to the open-ended questions about the experiment, i.e., explain why it was better to test a drug using a control group. Responses are to the following:

–When you read news stories, you see certain sets of words and terms. We are interested in how many people recognize certain kinds of terms, and I would like to ask you a few brief questions in that regard. First, some articles refer to the results of a scientific study. When you read or hear the term scientific study, do you have a clear understanding of what it means, a general sense of what it means, or little understanding of what it means?" If the response is "clear understanding" or "general sense": In your own words, could you tell me what it means to study something scientifically?

–Now, please think of this situation: Two scientists want to know if a certain drug is effective in treating high blood pressure. The first scientist wants to give the drug to 1,000 people with high blood pressure and see how many experience lower blood pressure levels. The second scientist wants to give the drug to 500 people with high blood pressure and not give the drug to another 500 people with high blood pressure and see how many in both groups experience lower blood pressure levels. Which is the better way to test this drug? Why is it better to test the drug this way?

–Now think about this situation: A doctor tells a couple that their "genetic makeup" means that they've got one in four chances of having a child with an inherited illness. Does this mean that if their first three children are healthy, the fourth will have the illness? Does this mean that if their first child has the illness, the next three will not? Does this mean that each of the couple's children will have the same risk of suffering from the illness? Does this mean that if they have only three children, none will have the illness?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-5 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-12.

Attitudes toward science and technology items included in the Index of Scientific Promise and the Index of Scientific Reservation: 2001
(Percentages)

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Do not know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Promise of science					
Science and technology are making our lives healthier, easier, and more comfortable.	14	72	3	10	1
Most scientists want to work on things that will make life better for the average person.	11	78	3	8	1
With the application of science and new technology, work will become more interesting.	9	63	5	21	2
Because of science and technology, there will be more opportunities for the next generation.	21	64	2	12	2
Reservations about science					
We depend too much on science and not enough on faith.	11	40	4	41	5
It is not important for me to know about science in my daily life.	2	14	1	61	22
Science makes our way of life change too fast.	4	34	2	54	5
	B>>H	B>H	B=H	H>B	H>>B
Have the benefits of scientific research outweighed the harmful results or have the harmful results outweighed the benefits?	47	25	19	7	3

B>>H = benefits strongly outweigh harmful results; B>H = benefits outweigh harmful results; B=H = benefits equal harmful results; H>B = harmful results outweigh benefits; H>>B = harmful results strongly outweigh benefits

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-13.

Results of Attitude Toward Organized Science Scale: 1983–2001

Items and characteristics	1983	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent									
Agree that “science and technology are making our lives healthier, easier, and more comfortable.”	84	86	87	84	85	86	89	90	86
Agree that “the benefits of science are greater than any harmful effects.”	57	68	76	72	73	72	75	75	72
Disagree that “science makes our way of life change too fast.”	50	53	59	60	63	60	61	57	59
Disagree that “we depend too much on science and not enough on faith.”	43	39	43	44	45	44	48	46	45
Mean ATOSS score									
All adults	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6
Male	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.7
Female	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5
Formal education									
Less than high school	1.8	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.1
High school graduate	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6
Baccalaureate	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0
Graduate/professional	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2
Science/mathematics education^a									
Low	NA	NA	NA	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4
Middle	NA	NA	NA	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8
High	NA	NA	NA	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1
Attentiveness to science or technology^b									
Attentive public	2.6	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9
Interested public	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.7
Residual public	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
Sample size (number)	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	3,977	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574

ATOSS = Attitude Toward Organized Science Scale; NA = not available

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue area, report that he or she is “very well informed” about it, and be a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Citizens who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue area. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Responses are to the following statement: “Now I would like to read you some statements like those you might find in a newspaper or magazine article. For each statement, please tell me if you generally agree or disagree. If you feel especially strongly about a statement, please tell me that you strongly agree or strongly disagree.” The scale is a count of agreement with the first two items and disagreement with the last two items. ATOSS scores for each respondent range from 0 to 4, with a score of 4 representing agreement with the first two items and disagreement with the last two, and a score of 0 representing disagreement with the first two items and agreement with the last two.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-14.

Belief that people would do better by living a simpler life: 1997, 1999, and 2001

Characteristic	1997	1999	2001
Percent			
All adults			
Strongly agree	6	7	7
Agree	37	39	37
Do not know	5	3	4
Disagree	48	48	48
Strongly disagree	4	3	5
Male			
Strongly agree	6	6	7
Agree	33	34	32
Do not know	4	4	2
Disagree	53	53	52
Strongly disagree	4	3	7
Female			
Strongly agree	7	6	6
Agree	41	45	41
Do not know	5	3	5
Disagree	44	44	44
Strongly disagree	3	2	4
Less than high school graduate			
Strongly agree	8	11	7
Agree	44	50	54
Do not know	7	5	5
Disagree	36	32	29
Strongly disagree	5	2	6
High school graduate			
Strongly agree	7	6	8
Agree	37	39	36
Do not know	4	3	3
Disagree	48	50	48
Strongly disagree	4	2	5
Baccalaureate and higher			
Strongly agree	3	2	4
Agree	29	27	25
Do not know	5	4	4
Disagree	59	61	60
Strongly disagree	4	6	6
Attentive public to science and technology^a			
Strongly agree	6	8	4
Agree	29	28	30
Do not know	3	3	6
Disagree	54	58	52
Strongly disagree	8	3	8
Sample size (number)			
All adults	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	930	900	751
Female	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: People would do better by living a simpler life without so much technology. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-15.

Belief that technological discoveries will destroy the Earth: 1997, 1999, and 2001

Characteristic	1997	1999	2001
Percent			
All adults			
Strongly agree	4	4	4
Agree	22	27	25
Do not know	6	5	4
Disagree	56	55	56
Strongly disagree	12	9	11
Male			
Strongly agree	5	5	4
Agree	21	24	23
Do not know	6	4	3
Disagree	53	56	57
Strongly disagree	15	11	13
Female			
Strongly agree	4	4	4
Agree	23	29	26
Do not know	7	6	5
Disagree	57	53	55
Strongly disagree	9	7	9
Less than high school graduate			
Strongly agree	7	8	7
Agree	26	35	43
Do not know	7	6	5
Disagree	48	48	43
Strongly disagree	12	3	3
High school graduate			
Strongly agree	4	4	4
Agree	24	27	24
Do not know	7	5	4
Disagree	56	56	57
Strongly disagree	9	8	11
Baccalaureate and higher			
Strongly agree	2	2	1
Agree	14	18	13
Do not know	4	5	5
Disagree	61	57	63
Strongly disagree	19	18	18
Attentive public to science and technology^a			
Strongly agree	4	8	3
Agree	11	18	23
Do not know	6	3	3
Disagree	60	56	53
Strongly disagree	19	15	19
Sample size (number)			
All adults	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	930	900	751
Female	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: Technological discoveries will eventually destroy the Earth. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-16.

Public assessment that technological development creates an artificial and inhuman way of living: 1997, 1999, and 2001

Characteristic	1997	1999	2001
Percentages			
All adults			
Strongly agree	2	2	3
Agree	27	29	27
Do not know	6	6	5
Disagree	58	58	57
Strongly disagree	7	5	8
Male			
Strongly agree	3	2	2
Agree	25	26	30
Do not know	4	5	4
Disagree	60	61	54
Strongly disagree	8	6	9
Female			
Strongly agree	2	3	3
Agree	29	31	25
Do not know	7	7	6
Disagree	56	56	60
Strongly disagree	6	4	6
Less than high school graduate			
Strongly agree	3	5	2
Agree	37	40	44
Do not know	9	13	8
Disagree	43	40	43
Strongly disagree	8	2	4
High school graduate			
Strongly agree	3	2	4
Agree	27	28	26
Do not know	6	5	6
Disagree	60	61	59
Strongly disagree	4	4	6
Baccalaureate and higher			
Strongly agree	1	1	1
Agree	16	18	18
Do not know	3	2	2
Disagree	68	66	64
Strongly disagree	12	13	15
Attentive public to science and technology^a			
Strongly agree	3	4	4
Agree	19	22	24
Do not know	1	2	2
Disagree	63	64	57
Strongly disagree	14	9	14
Sample size (number)			
All adults	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	930	900	751
Female	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate or higher	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue area. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: Technological development creates an artificial and inhuman way of living. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-17.

General attitudes toward science and technology: 1999 and 2001
 (Means)

Characteristic	1999			2001		
	P ^a	R ^b	P/R	P ^a	R ^b	P/R
All adults	66	45	1.46	60	47	1.30
Male	66	44	1.50	61	45	1.36
Female	64	48	1.35	57	48	1.18
Formal education						
Less than high school	63	51	1.23	57	54	1.06
High school graduate	65	46	1.40	60	47	1.28
Baccalaureate	68	39	1.74	63	40	1.55
Graduate/professional	69	38	1.80	65	39	1.65
Science/mathematics education^c						
Low	63	49	1.29	59	50	1.18
Middle	66	44	1.50	61	45	1.36
High	69	38	1.80	64	40	1.60
Attentiveness to science and technology^d						
Attentive public	69	40	1.72	65	41	1.58
Interested public	67	44	1.52	62	45	1.37
Residual public	62	49	1.26	58	49	1.17

P = promise of science and technology; R = reservations about science and technology; P/R = ratio of Promise Index to Reservation Index.

^aThe Index of Scientific Promise includes responses to the following statements:

I would like to read you some statements like those you might find in a newspaper or magazine article. For each statement, please tell me if you generally agree or disagree. If you feel especially strongly about a statement, please tell me that you strongly agree or disagree.

—Science and technology are making our lives healthier, easier, and more comfortable.

—Most scientists want to work on things that will make life better for the average person.

—With the application of science and new technology, work will become more interesting.

—Because of science and technology, there will be more opportunities for the next generation.

^bThe Index of Scientific Reservation includes responses to the following statements:

I would like to read you some statements like those you might find in a newspaper or magazine article. For each statement, please tell me if you generally agree or disagree. If you feel especially strongly about a statement, please tell me that you strongly agree or strongly disagree.

—We depend too much on science and not enough on faith.

—It is not important for me to know about science in my daily life.

—Science makes our way of life change too fast.

^cRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^dTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and is a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: The Index of Scientific Promise and the Index of Scientific Reservation are factor scores converted to a 0–100 scale. A factor analysis verified the existence of a two-factor structure. The lowest possible factor score (strong disagreement with all of the items) was set to 0, and the highest possible factor score (strong agreement with all of the items) was set to 100. All factor scores between the highest and the lowest were placed on the 0–100 scale accordingly.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-18.

Public assessment of general scientific research: 1979–2001

Characteristic	1979	1981	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent										
All adults										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	46	42	44	57	47	42	43	47	47	47
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	24	28	24	25	25	31	29	28	27	25
Benefits equal harmful results	19	13	13	5	15	11	16	13	11	19
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	7	12	13	9	10	12	10	8	10	7
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	4	5	6	4	3	4	3	4	5	3
Male										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	51	48	48	59	54	45	47	52	50	49
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	23	27	23	25	24	30	28	27	27	27
Benefits equal harmful results	16	11	10	5	9	9	13	10	9	15
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	7	10	13	7	9	11	9	7	10	7
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	3	5	6	4	4	5	4	4	4	2
Female										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	42	37	40	55	40	40	39	42	45	44
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	25	28	26	25	26	31	30	29	28	23
Benefits equal harmful results	23	16	14	6	20	13	19	15	12	22
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	6	14	14	10	11	12	10	10	10	8
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	4	5	6	4	3	4	3	4	5	3
Less than high school graduate										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	26	26	20	37	24	24	18	30	25	28
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	25	23	21	30	25	33	30	28	25	27
Benefits equal harmful results	32	25	26	9	30	17	34	21	18	26
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	12	18	20	17	17	20	14	18	22	13
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	5	9	13	7	4	7	3	3	10	6
High school graduate										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	50	43	47	59	49	41	44	46	47	45
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	26	31	26	25	27	32	30	30	31	25
Benefits equal harmful results	16	10	10	5	11	10	13	13	10	20
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	5	12	13	7	10	12	10	6	8	8
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	5	4	2
Baccalaureate and higher										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	69	64	67	80	72	66	67	67	71	64
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	18	22	23	16	18	22	23	23	19	23
Benefits equal harmful results	8	7	2	1	6	8	6	6	5	9
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	2	4	6	2	2	3	3	3	4	2
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
Attentive public to science and technology^a										
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	67	63	59	62	61	48	64	64	61	55
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	16	20	17	23	19	27	21	19	21	20
Benefits equal harmful results	8	5	7	6	10	12	8	6	5	13
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	4	8	13	6	6	9	3	8	11	9
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	2	4

See explanatory notes, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

Appendix table 7-18.

Public assessment of general scientific research: 1979–2001

Characteristic	1979	1981	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Sample size (number)										
All adults	1,635	1,536	2,005	975	2,033	997	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	773	724	950	475	964	464	953	930	900	751
Female	862	812	1,054	500	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate.....	465	385	507	259	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate.....	932	886	1,147	546	1,202	579	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	238	264	349	170	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology ^a	154	381	235	116	229	94	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and be a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue area. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not total 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are for the following statements:

–People have frequently noted that scientific research has produced both beneficial and harmful consequences.

–Would you say that, on balance, the benefits of scientific research have outweighed the harmful results, or have the harmful results of scientific research been greater than its benefits?

–Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of beneficial results or only slightly?

–Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of harmful results or only slightly?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-6 in Volume 1.

Page 2 of 2

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-19.

Public assessment of funding of scientific research by the Federal Government: 1985–2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
All adults								
Strongly agree	9	16	17	14	19	22	21	19
Agree	70	65	62	63	61	57	61	62
Do not know	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3
Disagree	16	14	15	18	17	15	13	15
Strongly disagree	0	1	2	2	2	3	2	1
Male								
Strongly agree	11	20	23	17	19	24	24	23
Agree	71	63	60	62	60	54	60	63
Do not know	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Disagree	15	13	13	17	18	16	12	11
Strongly disagree	1	2	2	2	1	3	2	2
Female								
Strongly agree	8	11	13	11	15	20	18	16
Agree	68	68	65	64	62	59	62	61
Do not know	8	6	5	4	5	4	4	5
Disagree	16	14	16	19	16	15	14	18
Strongly disagree	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
Less than high school graduate								
Strongly agree	5	6	10	10	8	20	17	13
Agree	65	66	59	61	59	50	55	66
Do not know	9	7	8	5	7	5	7	5
Disagree	21	18	20	21	24	22	18	16
Strongly disagree	0	3	3	3	2	3	3	0
High school graduate								
Strongly agree	8	17	18	12	16	19	18	18
Agree	72	66	65	64	63	60	66	60
Do not know	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	3
Disagree	15	13	14	19	17	15	12	17
Strongly disagree	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	1
Baccalaureate								
Strongly agree	19	26	27	22	24	31	34	23
Agree	68	62	60	64	62	56	53	68
Do not know	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
Disagree	10	8	10	12	11	10	10	8
Strongly disagree	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1
Graduate degree								
Strongly agree	20	29	31	26	43	40	40	32
Agree	70	61	58	53	46	51	51	56
Do not know	2	2	4	5	2	2	1	3
Disagree	8	7	6	14	8	5	8	8
Strongly disagree	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	1
Attentive public to science and technology^a								
Strongly agree	17	27	35	28	35	46	35	35
Agree	76	62	50	61	48	42	52	49
Do not know	0	2	4	1	1	1	0	3
Disagree	6	8	10	9	14	7	9	12
Strongly disagree	1	1	1	1	2	4	4	3

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue area, report that he or she is “very well informed” about it, and be a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Citizens who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue area. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Responses are to the following question: Even if it brings no immediate benefits, scientific research that advances the frontiers of knowledge is necessary and should be supported by the Federal Government—do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-20.

Support for Federal funding of basic scientific research^a, by level of Index of Scientific Promise, Index of Scientific Reservation, and by education: 2001
(Percentages)

Level of index and level of education	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Sample size (number)
Index of Scientific Promise^b				
All adults	16	3	81	1,569
Low	29	4	68	233
Moderate	15	3	82	1,107
High	6	1	93	229
Less than high school graduate	16	5	79	116
Low	29	6	65	20
Moderate	15	6	79	82
High	0	0	100	14
High school graduate	18	3	78	833
Low	33	3	64	140
Moderate	17	4	79	589
High	5	0	95	104
Baccalaureate and higher	9	1	90	610
Low	13	2	85	71
Moderate	8	1	91	430
High	9	5	86	109
Index of Scientific Reservation^c				
All adults	16	3	81	1,574
Low	7	1	91	197
Moderate	13	3	84	984
High	25	4	71	393
Less than high school graduate	16	5	79	116
Low	0	0	100	9
Moderate	14	5	81	49
High	20	6	74	58
High school graduate	18	3	79	834
Low	8	0	92	68
Moderate	14	3	83	511
High	30	4	67	255
Baccalaureate and higher	9	1	90	614
Low	8	4	88	119
Moderate	9	1	90	416
High	9	0	91	79

Low = 0–49; moderate = 50–74; high = 75–100

^aResponses are to the following question: Even if it brings no immediate benefits, scientific research that advances the frontiers of knowledge is necessary and should be supported by the Federal Government—do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

^bThe Index of Scientific Promise includes responses to the following statements:

Now I would like to read you some statements like those you might find in a newspaper or magazine article. For each statement, please tell me if you generally agree or disagree. If you feel especially strongly about a statement, please tell me that you strongly agree or disagree.

—Science and technology are making our lives healthier, easier, and more comfortable.

—Most scientists want to work on things that will make life better for the average person.

—With the application of science and new technology, work will become more interesting.

—Because of science and technology, there will be more opportunities for the next generation.

^cThe Index of Scientific Reservation includes responses to the following statements:

Now I would like to read you some statements like those you might find in a newspaper or magazine article. For each statement, please tell me if you generally agree or disagree. If you feel especially strongly about a statement, please tell me that you strongly agree or strongly disagree.

—We depend too much on science and not enough on faith.

—It is not important for me to know about science in my daily life.

—Science makes our way of life change too fast.

NOTES: The Index of Scientific Promise and Index of Scientific Reservation are factor scores converted to a 0–100 scale. Factor analysis verified the existence of a two-factor structure. The lowest possible factor score (strong disagreement with all of the items) was set to 0, and the highest possible factor score (strong agreement with all of the items) was set to 100. All factor scores between the highest and the lowest were placed on the 0–100 scale accordingly. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-7 in Volume 1.

Appendix table 7-21.

Public preferences for level of Federal Government spending on selected policy issues: 1981–2001
 (Percentages)

Policy issue	1981	1983	1985	1988	1990	1992	1997	1999	2001
Exploring space									
Too little	18	17	9	17	9	12	14	15	11
Too much	43	39	45	42	52	50	45	46	48
Reducing pollution									
Too little	52	54	69	76	76	72	65	65	63
Too much	14	11	6	4	5	7	8	7	6
Improving health care									
Too little	61	—	68	68	75	79	68	71	70
Too much	6	—	3	2	3	5	7	5	4
Supporting scientific research									
Too little	31	—	29	34	30	34	34	37	36
Too much	18	—	18	15	16	19	14	14	14
Improving education									
Too little	62	71	73	76	77	81	76	75	76
Too much	6	5	3	4	4	4	6	6	5
Helping older people									
Too little	73	—	72	76	75	73	66	71	73
Too much	3	—	3	2	2	4	5	4	3
Improving national defense ^a									
Too little	33	19	11	11	15	15	23	31	29
Too much	26	47	50	53	40	40	32	25	25
Helping low-income persons									
Too little	45	—	54	55	57	56	44	49	53
Too much	24	—	13	12	15	17	23	19	15
Sample size (number)	1,659	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	2,001	2,000	1,882	1,574

— = Not asked

^aThe “improving national defense” question was asked on a split ballot in 1988; therefore, the number of responses was only 1,013.

NOTES: Responses are to the following statement: “We are faced with many problems in this country. I’m going to name some of these problems, and for each one, I’d like you to tell me if you think that the Government is spending too little money on it, about the right amount, or too much.” Not shown are responses “about the right amount” and “don’t know” which is why percentages do not add to 100 percent.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-22.

Public preferences for level of Federal Government spending: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Exploring space	Reducing pollution	Improving health care	Supporting scientific research	Improving education	Helping older people	Improving national defense	Helping low-income people
All adults								
Too little	11	63	70	36	76	73	29	53
About right	38	28	24	44	17	21	41	30
Too much	48	6	4	14	5	3	25	15
Do not know	3	3	2	7	1	2	4	2
Male								
Too little	16	62	63	40	72	68	33	51
About right	39	29	31	44	20	25	40	31
Too much	43	7	5	12	7	5	25	16
Do not know	2	1	1	5	1	1	2	2
Female								
Too little	7	64	77	33	80	78	26	55
About right	36	27	18	44	15	18	42	28
Too much	53	4	3	16	4	1	26	14
Do not know	4	4	2	8	1	3	6	2
Less than high school graduate								
Too little	8	61	66	35	69	81	27	68
About right	24	28	29	34	21	13	37	18
Too much	65	9	4	26	8	4	29	11
Do not know	4	2	1	5	2	2	7	3
High school graduate								
Too little	11	64	73	34	79	76	32	54
About right	37	28	21	46	16	20	42	29
Too much	50	5	4	14	4	3	22	16
Do not know	2	2	2	6	1	1	4	1
Baccalaureate and higher								
Too little	16	63	64	42	74	62	24	41
About right	50	29	28	45	18	31	43	39
Too much	31	5	5	5	7	3	31	17
Do not know	3	3	3	8	1	3	2	3
Attentive public to science and technology^a								
Too little	28	70	66	52	74	69	33	59
About right	40	26	31	37	16	26	37	23
Too much	31	3	2	9	7	3	29	17
Do not know	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	1

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: Responses are to the following statement: We are faced with many problems in this country. I'm going to name some of these problems, and for each one, I'd like you to tell me if you think that the government is spending too little money on it, about the right amount, or too much.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-23.

Public assessment of genetic engineering: 1985–2001

Characteristic	1985	1990	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent						
All adults						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	23	20	21	19	20	19
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	26	27	22	23	24	21
Benefits equal harmful results	12	16	22	22	18	28
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	14	19	23	20	22	19
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	25	18	12	16	16	14
Male						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	26	21	24	23	24	23
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	28	31	22	26	26	22
Benefits equal harmful results	11	14	21	20	17	27
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	13	18	22	17	21	16
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	22	16	10	14	12	12
Female						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	19	19	18	16	16	14
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	25	23	22	21	22	20
Benefits equal harmful results	14	17	22	23	20	28
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	15	21	23	22	22	22
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	27	20	15	18	20	15
Less than high school graduate						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	19	16	10	15	18	15
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	29	27	19	18	19	24
Benefits equal harmful results	16	25	30	23	27	27
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	12	17	29	30	21	20
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	24	15	13	14	15	13
High school graduate						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	21	19	20	18	18	18
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	24	27	21	24	24	19
Benefits equal harmful results	13	12	21	21	16	28
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	15	21	23	18	24	21
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	27	21	14	19	18	15
Baccalaureate and higher						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	33	29	35	27	27	24
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	29	28	30	28	28	24
Benefits equal harmful results	7	15	16	21	16	27
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	13	15	14	14	17	15
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	18	13	6	10	12	10
Attentive public to science and technology^a						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	37	32	42	36	33	29
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	28	30	22	24	31	20
Benefits equal harmful results	9	9	16	13	8	20
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	12	12	13	16	19	20
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	14	17	7	11	9	10
Attentive public to medical research^a						
Benefits strongly outweigh harmful results	29	31	34	27	28	25
Benefits slightly outweigh harmful results	24	27	21	25	24	19
Benefits equal harmful results	12	12	17	18	12	27
Harmful results slightly outweigh benefits	11	17	18	18	23	20
Harmful results strongly outweigh benefits	24	13	9	12	13	9
Sample size (number)						
All adults	2,005	2,033	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	950	964	953	930	900	751
Female	1,054	1,070	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	507	495	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,143	1,179	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	349	359	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology ^a	235	229	195	288	216	195
Attentive public to medical research ^a	349	337	310	377	301	240

See explanatory notes, is any, and SOURCE at end of table

Appendix table 7-23.

Public assessment of genetic engineering: 1985–2001

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. In 1985, the question was worded: Some persons have argued that the creation of new life forms through genetic engineering constitutes a serious risk, while other persons have argued that this research may yield major benefits for society. In your opinion, are the risks of genetic engineering greater than the benefits, or are the benefits of genetic engineering research greater than the risks? Would you say that the benefits are substantially greater than the risks, or only slightly greater than the risks? Would you say that the risks are substantially greater than the benefits or only slightly greater than the benefits?

–In 1990, the question was worded: Some persons have argued that the creation of new life forms through genetic engineering research constitutes a serious risk, while other persons have argued that this research may yield major benefits for society. In your opinion, are the risks of genetic engineering research greater than its benefits, or are the benefits of genetic engineering research greater than its risks? Would you say that the benefits have substantially exceeded the risks or only slightly exceeded the risks? Would you say that the risks have substantially exceeded the benefits or only slightly exceeded the benefits?

–In 1995, the question was worded: Some persons have argued that the creation of new life forms through genetic engineering research constitutes a serious risk, while other persons have argued that this research may yield major benefits for society. In your opinion, have the benefits of genetic engineering research outweighed the harmful results, or have the harmful results of genetic engineering research been greater than its benefits? Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of beneficial results or only slightly? Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of harmful results or only slightly?

–In 1997 and 1999, half of the respondents were asked the question used in 1995. The other half were asked: Some persons have argued that the modification of existing life forms through genetic engineering research constitutes a serious risk, while other persons have argued that this research may yield major benefits for society. In your opinion, have the benefits of engineering research outweighed the harmful results, or have the harmful results of genetic engineering research been greater than its benefits? Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of beneficial results or only slightly? Would you say that the balance has been strongly in favor of harmful results or only slightly? In 2001, all respondents were asked this question.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-8 in Volume 1.

Appendix table 7-24.

Public assessment of selected biotechnology applications: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Food production	Genetic testing	Animal cloning
All adults (number = 1,574)			
Strongly support	14	51	15
Moderately support	47	38	32
No opinion	2	*	2
Moderately oppose	21	6	21
Strongly oppose	15	3	27
Do not know	2	2	3
Male (number = 751)			
Strongly support	19	52	19
Moderately support	51	39	38
No opinion	1	*	1
Moderately oppose	16	6	18
Strongly oppose	12	2	22
Do not know	1	1	2
Female (number = 823)			
Strongly support	9	50	12
Moderately support	43	38	27
No opinion	2	1	3
Moderately oppose	25	5	23
Strongly oppose	18	3	32
Do not know	3	3	3
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)			
Strongly support	14	48	26
Moderately support	47	33	28
No opinion	1	0	1
Moderately oppose	18	8	16
Strongly oppose	20	6	27
Do not know	*	5	3
High school graduate (number= 834)			
Strongly support	12	50	12
Moderately support	46	40	32
No opinion	2	*	1
Moderately oppose	24	6	21
Strongly oppose	15	3	31
Do not know	2	2	3
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)			
Strongly support	19	55	16
Moderately support	49	38	37
No opinion	2	1	3
Moderately oppose	17	4	24
Strongly oppose	12	2	19
Do not know	1	1	3
Attentive public to science and technology (number = 195)			
Strongly support	26	62	21
Moderately support	50	30	36
No opinion	1	*	2
Moderately oppose	12	3	18
Strongly oppose	9	3	20
Do not know	3	1	3

* = <.5

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Responses are to the following statements:

As you may know, some food products and medicines are being developed using new scientific techniques. The general area is called *biotechnology* and includes tools such as genetic engineering and genetic modification of food. I'm going to name three types of biotechnology applications. I'd like you to tell me if you strongly support, moderately support, moderately oppose, or strongly oppose these uses of biotechnology.

–Using modern biotechnology in the production of foods, for example, to make them higher in protein, keep longer, or taste better.

–Using genetic testing to detect diseases we might have inherited from our parents, such as cystic fibrosis.

–Cloning animals such as sheep whose milk can be used to make drugs and vaccines. Overall would you say you strongly support, moderately support, moderately oppose, or strongly oppose this use of biotechnology?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-25.

Public assessment of space exploration: 1985–2001

Characteristic	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent								
All adults								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	27	22	18	17	22	24	24	22
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	27	25	25	26	24	24	25	23
Benefits equal costs	7	9	9	9	8	10	8	12
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	15	18	17	22	17	17	17	15
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	24	26	31	26	28	25	26	28
Male								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	33	28	23	17	28	31	31	28
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	31	27	26	26	25	25	26	22
Benefits equal costs	6	10	8	9	6	8	5	10
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	12	13	16	22	16	15	15	13
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	18	22	27	26	24	21	23	26
Female								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	21	16	14	11	17	18	19	17
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	24	23	24	25	23	23	24	23
Benefits equal costs	8	9	10	11	10	12	10	14
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	17	23	17	27	18	18	18	16
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	30	29	35	26	32	29	29	29
Less than high school graduate								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	22	16	15	14	14	18	15	13
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	25	26	20	29	20	21	25	20
Benefits equal costs	10	9	17	12	13	16	15	10
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	17	21	16	24	21	24	18	19
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	26	29	32	21	31	21	27	37
High school graduate								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	26	21	17	15	23	23	26	22
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	28	25	25	25	24	23	23	22
Benefits equal costs	6	9	7	9	6	9	5	12
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	14	18	17	23	17	16	17	15
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	26	27	34	28	30	29	29	28
Baccalaureate and higher								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	36	33	27	22	32	31	31	30
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	28	26	28	26	27	29	29	25
Benefits equal costs	6	10	7	6	8	8	6	14
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	13	15	16	18	14	12	16	11
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	17	16	22	28	20	20	18	19
Attentive public to science and technology^a								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	39	38	26	28	32	44	34	35
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	27	28	33	26	25	22	28	29
Benefits equal costs	7	6	4	11	7	6	2	7
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	13	10	14	20	16	11	17	13
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	14	21	23	15	20	17	19	16
Attentive public to space exploration^a								
Benefits strongly outweigh costs	49	46	36	38	52	57	41	49
Benefits slightly outweigh costs	25	30	36	44	23	19	26	26
Benefits equal costs	8	4	3	3	4	6	2	8
Costs slightly outweigh benefits	11	7	11	6	12	10	19	6
Costs strongly outweigh benefits	7	13	14	9	9	8	12	11
Sample size (number)								
All adults	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	950	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	507	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	349	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology ^a	235	233	229	105	195	288	216	195
Attentive public to space exploration ^a	184	163	123	51	99	168	120	99

See explanatory notes, if any, and SOURCE at end of table

Appendix table 7-25.

Public assessment of space exploration: 1985–2001

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following questions: Many current issues in science and technology may be viewed as a judgment of relative benefits. Thinking first about the space program, some persons have argued that the costs of the space program may have exceeded its benefits, while other people have argued that the benefits of space exploration have exceeded its costs.

–In your opinion, have the costs of space exploration exceeded its benefits, or have the benefits of space exploration exceeded its costs?

–Would you say that the benefits have substantially exceeded the costs, or only slightly exceeded the costs?

–Would you say that the costs have substantially exceeded the benefits or only slightly exceeded the benefits?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-12 in Volume 1.

Appendix table 7-26.

Public assessment of use of mice in scientific research: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Strongly agree	Agree	Do not know	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Sample size (number)
All adults	9	59	3	23	7	1,574
Male	12	63	2	18	5	751
Female	6	55	4	27	8	823
Formal education						
Less than high school	3	58	4	23	12	116
High school graduate	10	58	3	24	6	834
Baccalaureate degree and higher	11	61	2	21	5	614
Science/mathematics education^a						
Low	8	57	4	24	7	674
Middle	7	61	2	22	8	469
High	13	59	2	21	4	431
Age (years)						
18–24	3	52	2	26	17	154
25–34	9	54	2	29	6	288
35–44	11	59	2	23	5	320
45–64	10	59	4	22	5	557
65 and older	8	69	4	16	3	240
Attentiveness to science and technology^b						
Attentive public	13	54	4	21	8	195
Interested public	10	61	2	21	6	755
Residual public	6	58	3	26	7	624
Question order^c						
Mice first	9	59	4	23	5	787
Dogs and chimps first	9	59	2	23	8	787

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/mathematics courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

^cHalf the survey respondents were first asked about their attitudes toward the use of mice in scientific research, and then asked about their attitudes toward the use of dogs and chimpanzees in scientific research. The other respondents were asked these questions in the opposite order. See appendix table 7-27.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statement: Scientists should be allowed to do research that causes pain and injury to animals like mice if it produces new information about human health problems. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-27.

Public assessment of use of dogs and chimpanzees in scientific research: 1988–2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent							
All adults							
Strongly agree	5	5	9	7	7	7	6
Agree	48	45	44	43	39	43	38
Do not know	5	6	5	4	3	3	4
Disagree	28	31	28	33	33	30	35
Strongly disagree	14	13	14	13	18	17	17
Male							
Strongly agree	7	7	13	10	11	9	9
Agree	55	55	52	52	47	53	47
Do not know	5	4	3	3	3	3	4
Disagree	26	26	25	26	28	27	30
Strongly disagree	7	8	7	9	11	8	10
Female							
Strongly agree	4	3	6	4	5	5	3
Agree	41	36	37	35	32	33	30
Do not know	6	7	6	5	3	4	5
Disagree	30	35	31	40	37	33	39
Strongly disagree	19	19	20	16	23	25	23
Less than high school graduate							
Strongly agree	3	4	8	7	4	11	3
Agree	53	49	47	44	28	44	38
Do not know	6	6	4	5	2	4	3
Disagree	26	30	28	34	43	29	40
Strongly disagree	12	11	13	10	23	12	16
High school graduate							
Strongly agree	5	5	8	5	8	5	6
Agree	44	41	42	41	39	42	38
Do not know	5	6	5	4	4	3	5
Disagree	31	32	30	35	31	31	34
Strongly disagree	15	16	15	15	18	19	17
Baccalaureate and higher							
Strongly agree	9	6	13	11	10	10	8
Agree	52	53	50	48	51	47	40
Do not know	7	7	5	4	4	3	4
Disagree	23	26	22	26	26	25	32
Strongly disagree	9	8	10	11	9	15	16
Attentive public to science and technology^a							
Strongly agree	7	7	10	15	10	9	8
Agree	52	43	45	42	36	48	44
Do not know	6	7	3	3	6	2	3
Disagree	21	29	24	25	24	23	31
Strongly disagree	14	14	18	15	24	18	14
Adults 18–24 years old							
Strongly agree	4	3	15	4	6	4	4
Agree	43	35	37	35	20	34	38
Do not know	3	4	2	2	4	0	4
Disagree	29	32	26	37	41	27	32
Strongly disagree	21	26	20	22	29	35	22
Adults 25–34 years old							
Strongly agree	5	5	10	8	7	4	5
Agree	45	40	40	41	42	48	32
Do not know	5	4	3	4	2	1	3
Disagree	30	35	33	34	33	35	42
Strongly disagree	15	16	14	13	16	12	17

See explanatory notes, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

Appendix table 7-27.

Public assessment of use of dogs and chimpanzees in scientific research: 1988–2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Adults 35–44 years old							
Strongly agree	5	6	9	8	7	5	6
Agree	47	44	41	41	41	45	39
Do not know	6	6	6	4	4	4	2
Disagree	28	31	30	34	33	30	33
Strongly disagree	14	13	14	13	15	16	20
Adults 45–54 years old							
Strongly agree	4	4	6	6	7	7	5
Agree	50	54	41	43	38	52	35
Do not know	5	4	5	4	5	3	7
Disagree	27	27	31	35	29	22	36
Strongly disagree	14	11	17	12	21	16	17
Adults 55–64 years old							
Strongly agree	5	3	9	10	10	8	8
Agree	52	51	47	48	45	44	39
Do not know	6	10	8	4	2	1	4
Disagree	27	29	24	31	29	33	35
Strongly disagree	10	7	12	7	14	14	15
Adults 65 and older							
Strongly agree	6	6	7	5	8	15	7
Agree	53	52	61	53	45	37	48
Do not know	6	9	5	7	4	10	6
Disagree	27	26	21	27	33	28	32
Strongly disagree	8	7	6	8	10	10	7
Sample size (number)							
All adults	2,041	2,033	2,001	2,006	996	904	1,574
Male	958	964	950	953	454	455	751
Female	1,084	1,070	1,051	1,053	542	449	823
Less than high school graduate	530	495	403	418	216	188	116
High school graduate	1,158	1,202	1,202	1,196	579	534	834
Baccalaureate and higher	353	336	306	392	200	182	614
Age (years)							
18–24	318	322	276	275	146	134	154
25–34	485	497	459	471	223	198	288
35–44	372	366	430	423	199	188	320
45–54	264	264	318	308	171	140	309
55–64	267	269	191	205	90	98	248
65 and older	332	315	326	321	163	145	240

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statement: Scientists should be allowed to do research that causes pain and injury to animals like dogs and chimpanzees if it produces new information about human health problems. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

Appendix table 7-28.
Public belief in global warming: 2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Believe	77
Do not believe	12
Not sure/refused	11
Male (number = 751)	
Believe	78
Do not believe	14
Not sure/refused	8
Female (number = 823)	
Believe	76
Do not believe	9
Not sure/refused	14
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Believe	71
Do not believe	10
Not sure/refused	18
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Believe	77
Do not believe	12
Not sure/refused	11
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Believe	80
Do not believe	12
Not sure/refused	8
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Believe	82
Do not believe	12
Not sure/refused	6

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Responses are to the following question: Do you believe the theory that increased carbon dioxide and other gases released into the atmosphere will, if unchecked, lead to global warming and an increase in average temperatures?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-29.

Public assessment of global warming: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Very serious	53
Somewhat serious	33
Not a serious problem	10
Not sure/refused	4
Male (number = 751)	
Very serious	55
Somewhat serious	32
Not a serious problem	12
Not sure/refused	2
Female (number = 823)	
Very serious	52
Somewhat serious	34
Not a serious problem	9
Not sure/refused	5
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Very serious	51
Somewhat serious	31
Not a serious problem	10
Not sure/refused	8
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Very serious	53
Somewhat serious	33
Not a serious problem	11
Not sure/refused	3
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Very serious	56
Somewhat serious	34
Not a serious problem	9
Not sure/refused	2
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Very serious	62
Somewhat serious	24
Not a serious problem	12
Not sure/refused	2

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Responses are to the following question: Do you think that the possibility of global warming should be treated as a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, or not a serious problem?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-30.

Public assessment of the quality of science and mathematics education in the United States: 1985–2001

Characteristic	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent								
All adults								
Strongly agree	14	18	24	24	21	23	21	17
Agree	49	50	48	51	48	45	42	51
Do not know	8	7	4	4	6	6	7	7
Disagree	27	23	22	19	22	22	26	24
Strongly disagree	2	2	2	2	3	4	4	2
Male								
Strongly agree	14	17	24	24	20	22	19	17
Agree	49	50	50	51	49	44	46	52
Do not know	7	7	3	3	5	6	6	6
Disagree	28	23	21	19	23	25	25	23
Strongly disagree	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	2
Female								
Strongly agree	14	18	24	24	21	24	23	16
Agree	49	49	46	50	48	45	38	50
Do not know	9	7	5	5	7	7	7	7
Disagree	26	24	22	19	21	20	28	25
Strongly disagree	2	2	3	2	3	4	4	2
Less than high school graduate								
Strongly agree	7	11	19	17	14	14	14	8
Agree	53	51	45	51	47	45	36	44
Do not know	11	14	9	5	13	10	12	9
Disagree	27	22	23	24	22	27	32	38
Strongly disagree	2	2	4	3	4	4	6	0
High school graduate								
Strongly agree	15	19	24	24	20	24	22	16
Agree	48	49	49	50	49	45	44	52
Do not know	7	5	3	4	5	6	5	7
Disagree	28	25	22	19	23	21	26	23
Strongly disagree	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	2
Baccalaureate and higher								
Strongly agree	22	24	30	29	28	29	27	24
Agree	45	50	48	53	48	44	44	52
Do not know	5	4	3	2	3	4	5	5
Disagree	25	20	16	15	19	20	21	17
Strongly disagree	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	2
Attentive public for science and technology^a								
Strongly agree	20	26	36	31	32	33	32	22
Agree	53	48	46	49	42	37	36	45
Do not know	5	5	1	3	2	4	5	7
Disagree	20	20	15	14	21	21	19	22
Strongly disagree	2	1	2	4	3	5	7	4
Sample size (number)								
All adults	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	950	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	507	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	349	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology ^a	235	233	229	105	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statement: The quality of science and mathematics education in American schools is inadequate. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-31.

Public confidence in leadership of various institutions: 1973–2000
(Percentages)

Institution	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1980	1982	1983	1984	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1993	1994	1996	1998	2000
Medicine	54	60	50	54	51	46	52	45	51	50	46	52	51	46	46	48	39	41	45	44	44
Scientific community	37	45	39	43	41	36	41	38	41	44	39	45	39	40	37	41	37	38	39	40	41
Military	32	40	35	39	36	29	28	31	29	36	31	34	34	32	33	60	42	37	37	36	39
U.S. Supreme Court	31	33	31	35	35	28	25	30	27	33	30	36	35	34	35	37	31	30	28	37	32
Banks and financial institutions	—	—	32	39	42	33	32	27	24	31	21	27	27	19	18	12	15	18	25	26	29
Major companies	29	31	19	22	27	22	27	23	24	30	24	30	25	24	25	20	21	25	23	26	28
Organized religion	35	44	24	30	40	31	35	32	28	31	25	29	20	22	23	25	23	24	25	27	28
Education	37	49	31	37	41	28	30	33	29	28	28	35	29	30	27	30	22	25	23	27	27
Executive Branch of Federal Government	29	14	13	13	28	12	12	19	13	18	21	18	16	20	23	26	12	11	10	14	13
Organized labor	15	18	10	12	15	11	15	12	8	8	8	10	10	9	11	11	8	10	11	11	13
Congress	23	17	13	14	19	13	9	13	10	12	16	16	15	17	15	18	7	8	8	11	12
Press	23	26	24	28	25	20	22	18	13	17	18	18	18	17	15	16	11	8	11	9	10
Television	18	23	18	19	17	14	16	14	12	13	15	12	14	14	14	14	12	9	10	10	10
Average^a	30	33	26	29	31	24	26	26	24	27	25	28	26	25	25	29	22	22	23	24	25
Sample size (number)	1,504	1,484	1,490	1,499	1,530	1,532	1,468	1,506	1,599	989	1,470	1,466	997	1,035	899	1,017	1,057	2,011	1,925	1,911	1,887

— = not asked

^aAverage does not include banks and financial institutions.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. The survey was not conducted in 1979 and 1981, and the question was not asked in 1985. Percentages represent those respondents expressing a “great deal of confidence” when asked the following question: “As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, would you say that you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them?”

SOURCE: J.A. Davis and T.W. Smith, *General Social Surveys, Cumulative Codebook* (Chicago: University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center).

See figure 7-14 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-32.

Response to statement, “Scientists are helping to solve challenging problems”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	17
Agree	79
Do not know	1
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	*
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	21
Agree	77
Do not know	1
Disagree	1
Strongly disagree	1
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	15
Agree	81
Do not know	2
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	1
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	9
Agree	85
Do not know	2
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	2
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	17
Agree	79
Do not know	1
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	24
Agree	75
Do not know	*
Disagree	*
Strongly disagree	*
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	31
Agree	68
Do not know	1
Disagree	*
Strongly disagree	0

* = <.5

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-33.

Response to statement, “Scientific researchers are dedicated people who work for the good of humanity”: 2001

(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	11
Agree	75
Do not know	3
Disagree	9
Strongly disagree	1
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	11
Agree	74
Do not know	3
Disagree	11
Strongly disagree	1
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	11
Agree	76
Do not know	4
Disagree	8
Strongly disagree	1
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	82
Do not know	3
Disagree	7
Strongly disagree	1
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	13
Agree	74
Do not know	3
Disagree	9
Strongly disagree	1
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	10
Agree	73
Do not know	4
Disagree	12
Strongly disagree	1
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	23
Agree	61
Do not know	4
Disagree	10
Strongly disagree	1

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-34.

Response to statement, “A scientist usually works alone”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	15
Do not know	3
Disagree	65
Strongly disagree	15
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	15
Do not know	2
Disagree	64
Strongly disagree	17
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	15
Do not know	3
Disagree	66
Strongly disagree	13
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	22
Do not know	5
Disagree	55
Strongly disagree	14
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	15
Do not know	2
Disagree	66
Strongly disagree	14
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	11
Do not know	2
Disagree	70
Strongly disagree	17
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	5
Agree	16
Do not know	3
Disagree	58
Strongly disagree	18

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-35.

Response to statement, “Scientists don’t get as much fun out of life as other people do”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	16
Do not know	8
Disagree	63
Strongly disagree	9
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	17
Do not know	8
Disagree	61
Strongly disagree	11
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	16
Do not know	8
Disagree	66
Strongly disagree	8
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	34
Do not know	8
Disagree	49
Strongly disagree	6
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	14
Do not know	9
Disagree	65
Strongly disagree	8
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	10
Do not know	6
Disagree	69
Strongly disagree	13
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	5
Agree	20
Do not know	7
Disagree	48
Strongly disagree	21

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-36.

Response to statement, “Scientists are apt to be odd and peculiar people”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	23
Do not know	4
Disagree	63
Strongly disagree	8
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	25
Do not know	3
Disagree	62
Strongly disagree	7
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	20
Do not know	5
Disagree	65
Strongly disagree	8
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	34
Do not know	4
Disagree	52
Strongly disagree	6
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	21
Do not know	4
Disagree	65
Strongly disagree	7
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	19
Do not know	2
Disagree	67
Strongly disagree	11
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	25
Do not know	5
Disagree	54
Strongly disagree	13

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-37.

Response to statement, “Scientists have few other interests but their work”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	27
Do not know	8
Disagree	59
Strongly disagree	5
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	31
Do not know	6
Disagree	57
Strongly disagree	5
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	23
Do not know	9
Disagree	61
Strongly disagree	4
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	36
Do not know	8
Disagree	50
Strongly disagree	3
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	28
Do not know	8
Disagree	58
Strongly disagree	4
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	17
Do not know	6
Disagree	69
Strongly disagree	7
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	19
Do not know	7
Disagree	62
Strongly disagree	9

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-38.

Response to statement, “Scientists are not likely to be very religious people”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	26
Do not know	11
Disagree	54
Strongly disagree	5
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	30
Do not know	11
Disagree	50
Strongly disagree	5
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	23
Do not know	12
Disagree	57
Strongly disagree	5
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	5
Agree	29
Do not know	12
Disagree	51
Strongly disagree	3
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	27
Do not know	11
Disagree	54
Strongly disagree	5
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	24
Do not know	10
Disagree	57
Strongly disagree	6
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	23
Do not know	9
Disagree	52
Strongly disagree	9

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-39.

Attitude toward or interest in science career: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Daughter	Son
All adults (number = 1,574)		
Happy	80	80
Not care	18	18
Unhappy	2	2
Male (number = 751)		
Happy	81	80
Not care	18	19
Unhappy	1	1
Female (number = 823)		
Happy	79	80
Not care	18	18
Unhappy	3	3
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)		
Happy	80	78
Not care	13	15
Unhappy	8	7
High school graduate (number = 834)		
Happy	78	78
Not care	21	21
Unhappy	1	1
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)		
Happy	86	86
Not care	13	14
Unhappy	1	*
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)		
Happy	86	86
Not care	12	12
Unhappy	3	3

* = <.5

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following questions:

—Now I'd like you to consider the following situations. If you had a daughter, how would you feel if she wanted to be a scientist—would you feel happy, unhappy, or would you not care one way or the other?

—If you had a son, how would you feel if he wanted to be a scientist—would you feel happy, unhappy, or would you not care one way or the other?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-40.

Response to statement, “Scientific work is dangerous”: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	47
Do not know	2
Disagree	41
Strongly disagree	4
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	47
Do not know	2
Disagree	41
Strongly disagree	4
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	47
Do not know	2
Disagree	41
Strongly disagree	4
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	10
Agree	60
Do not know	1
Disagree	26
Strongly disagree	2
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	7
Agree	49
Do not know	3
Disagree	38
Strongly disagree	3
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	29
Do not know	3
Disagree	60
Strongly disagree	7
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	6
Agree	39
Do not know	3
Disagree	44
Strongly disagree	9

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-41.
Access to the World Wide Web at home: 2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	No	Yes	Sample size (number)
All adults	41	59	1,574
Male	37	63	751
Female	45	55	823
Formal education			
Less than high school	68	32	116
High school graduate	42	58	834
Baccalaureate degree	19	81	393
Graduate/professional degree	19	81	221
Science/mathematics education^a			
Low	55	45	674
Middle	31	69	469
High	18	82	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b			
Attentive public	33	67	195
Interested public	34	66	755
Residual public	52	48	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-42.

Leading source of information about current news events: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Newspaper	Magazine	Internet	Books/ other print	TV	Radio	Family	Friend/ colleague	Other	Don't know	Sample size (number)
All adults	29	3	7	*	53	5	*	1	1	*	1,574
Male	29	4	10	*	48	7	*	1	1	*	751
Female	29	3	5	1	57	4	*	1	1	*	823
Formal education											
Less than high school	22	2	3	0	69	1	0	4	0	1	116
High school graduate	29	3	7	*	54	6	*	1	1	*	834
Baccalaureate degree	30	7	12	1	42	8	0	1	*	*	393
Graduate/professional degree	43	6	10	1	30	9	*	1	1	*	221
Science/mathematics education^a											
Low	25	2	3	*	62	4	*	2	*	*	674
Middle	33	4	9	*	46	5	*	1	1	1	469
High	33	6	16	*	35	9	*	1	1	*	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b											
Attentive public	37	7	8	*	44	3	0	*	1	*	195
Interested public	27	4	9	1	53	6	*	1	1	*	755
Residual public	29	2	6	*	55	6	0	2	1	*	624

* = <.5

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: We are interested in how people get information about events in the news. Thinking about the kind of issues we have been talking about, where do you get most of your information about current news events?

SOURCES: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-19 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-43.

Leading source of information about science and technology: 2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	Newspaper	Magazine	Internet	Books/ other printed	TV	Radio	Government agency	Family	Friend/ colleague	Other	Don't know	Sample size (number)
All adults	16	16	9	2	44	3	*	2	1	5	2	1,574
Male	17	18	13	2	41	4	*	1	1	3	1	751
Female	16	14	6	2	48	2	1	2	1	6	2	823
Formal Education												
Less than high school	13	9	2	4	53	4	1	1	1	9	4	116
High school graduate	16	15	10	2	48	2	*	2	1	3	1	834
Baccalaureate degree	17	23	16	3	31	3	0	1	1	4	1	393
Graduate/professional degree	25	30	11	2	23	2	*	1	1	4	0	221
Science/mathematics education^a												
Low	16	12	5	2	53	3	*	2	1	5	2	674
Middle	19	18	12	1	39	2	*	2	1	4	1	469
High	15	27	19	4	28	3	*	1	1	4	*	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b												
Attentive public	20	35	14	3	21	1	*	1	0	5	0	195
Interested public	14	18	11	2	46	3	*	2	1	4	*	755
Residual public	18	10	7	2	48	3	*	1	1	5	3	624

* = <.5

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: We are also interested in how people get information about science and technology. Thinking about the kind of issues we have been talking about, where do you get most of your information about science and technology?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-19 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-44.

Leading source of information about specific scientific issue: 2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	Newspaper	Magazine	Internet	Books/ other printed	TV	Radio	Government agency	Family	Friend/ colleague	Other	Don't know	Sample size (number)
All adults	4	8	44	24	6	*	*	*	1	8	5	1,574
Male	4	9	45	22	6	*	*	*	1	8	5	751
Female	2	8	43	26	6	0	1	1	*	8	5	823
Formal education												
Less than high school	3	5	26	29	13	0	0	1	1	9	12	116
High school graduate	3	7	45	25	6	0	*	*	*	8	4	834
Baccalaureate degree	3	13	55	18	3	*	1	*	0	7	1	393
Graduate/professional degree	2	13	55	21	1	0	*	0	1	6	1	221
Science/mathematics education^a												
Low	4	8	33	28	9	0	*	1	1	8	7	674
Middle	2	7	53	23	4	0	*	*	*	8	2	469
High	2	12	60	15	2	*	1	*	1	8	0	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b												
Attentive public	3	11	47	25	5	0	0	0	*	5	2	195
Interested public	2	10	49	23	7	0	*	*	*	6	2	755
Residual public	4	6	38	25	6	*	*	1	1	11	8	624

* = <.5

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: If you wanted to learn more about a scientific issue such as global warming or biotechnology, how would you get more information?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

See figure 7-19 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-45.

Users of public information on an annual basis: 2001

Characteristic	Average number of visits per year		
	Science museum	Public library	Sample size (number)
All adults	3	10	1,574
Male	3	9	751
Female	3	12	823
Formal education			
Less than high school	2	6	116
High school graduate	2	10	834
Baccalaureate	4	14	393
Graduate/professional	4	18	221
Science/mathematics education^a			
Low	2	7	674
Middle	3	13	469
High	4	15	431
Attentiveness to science or technology^b			
Attentive public	4	13	195
Interested public	3	11	755
Residual public	2	9	624
Access to cable/satellite TV			
Cable and satellite	2	14	42
Cable	3	10	991
Satellite	2	9	253
Neither ^c	2	11	286

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

^cIncludes respondents who reported that they did not watch any television.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statements:

I am going to read to you a short list of places and ask you to tell me how many times you visited each type of place during the last year, that is, the last 12 months. If you did not visit a given place, just say none.

—A natural history museum?

—A zoo or an aquarium?

—A science or technology museum?

—A public library?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-46.

Viewers watching news magazines, public television, and science television shows: 2001

(Percentages)

Characteristic	TV news magazines			Public television			NOVA			National Geographic specials			Sample size (number)
	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	
All adults	31	52	16	22	49	29	8	29	63	21	57	21	1,574
Male	25	56	19	20	49	30	8	33	59	24	56	18	751
Female	37	49	14	24	50	28	7	25	68	19	58	25	823
Formal education													
Less than high school	21	51	28	23	39	38	4	19	77	21	49	30	116
High school graduate	34	53	13	19	50	31	7	26	67	22	58	20	834
Baccalaureate degree	29	53	17	25	58	17	11	42	47	21	60	19	393
Graduate/professional degree ...	31	54	15	35	47	17	15	44	41	22	58	20	221
Science/mathematics education^a													
Low	32	51	17	22	46	33	6	25	69	21	55	23	674
Middle	33	53	15	20	53	27	8	29	62	21	59	20	469
High	25	57	18	26	53	21	11	39	50	23	59	18	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b													
Attentive public	40	43	17	31	50	19	20	33	47	34	52	14	195
Interested public	32	52	16	22	50	28	8	32	60	24	60	17	755
Residual public	27	55	17	19	49	32	4	24	71	16	55	29	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following questions:

I'd like to read you a short list of television shows and ask you to tell me whether you watch each show regularly, that is, most of the time, occasionally, or not at all.

–News magazine shows like *60 Minutes*, *20/20*, or *Dateline*.

–How about public television programs other than *NOVA*? *NOVA*? *National Geographic Specials*?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-47.

Viewers watching television news: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Every day	A few times a week	Once a week	Less than once a week	Never	Sample size (number)
All adults	63	27	5	3	2	1,574
Male	60	29	6	3	2	751
Female	66	25	4	3	2	823
Formal education						
Less than high school	61	29	6	2	2	116
High school graduate	66	25	5	3	1	834
Baccalaureate degree	57	32	5	3	2	393
Graduate/professional degree	63	23	4	5	5	221
Science/mathematics education^a						
Low	67	23	5	3	2	674
Middle	60	31	4	3	2	469
High	57	30	5	6	2	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b						
Attentive public	71	21	6	2	1	195
Interested public	65	25	5	3	2	755
Residual public	60	29	5	4	3	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-48.
Daily newspaper readers: 1979–2001

Characteristic	1979	1981	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent										
All adults	60	62	61	53	57	56	47	46	41	42
Male	63	64	66	52	63	63	52	49	44	45
Female	57	61	57	55	52	50	43	43	38	39
Formal education										
Less than high school	52	56	55	46	53	47	42	41	36	23
High school graduate	59	62	61	54	55	56	46	44	40	44
Baccalaureate degree	74	68	68	59	71	59	55	53	48	48
Graduate/professional degree	84	75	79	68	70	70	60	59	57	60
Attentiveness to science or technology^a										
Attentive public	88	88	85	77	87	76	77	79	75	78
Interested public	56	59	55	51	54	53	41	38	35	38
Residual public	58	57	61	50	53	54	48	42	38	38
Sample size (number)										
All adults	1,635	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	773	775	950	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	862	856	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	465	404	507	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	932	941	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	238	282	349	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	154	208	235	233	229	105	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-20 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-49.

Users of various sources of information: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Newspaper every day	News magazine read regularly	Public library visits per year		Science museum 1 or more visits per year	Sample size (number)
			1 or more	5 or more		
All adults	42	16	75	48	66	1,574
Male	45	17	71	42	64	751
Female	39	14	78	53	68	823
Formal education						
Less than high school	23	7	60	27	54	116
High school graduate	44	13	74	48	64	834
Baccalaureate	48	25	85	62	81	393
Graduate/professional	60	31	85	67	83	221
Science/mathematics education^a						
Low	38	11	68	37	56	674
Middle	43	17	81	58	75	469
High	50	27	95	61	82	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b						
Attentive public	78	29	78	55	75	195
Interested public	38	15	78	51	68	755
Residual public	38	13	70	42	62	624
Access to cable/satellite TV						
Cable and satellite	42	17	90	56	60	42
Cable	49	19	75	48	69	991
Satellite	35	10	73	43	63	253
Neither ^c	27	9	74	49	61	286

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

^cIncludes respondents who reported that they did not watch any television.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following questions:

–How often do you read a newspaper: every day, a few times a week, once a week, or less than once a week?

–Are there any magazines that you read regularly, that is, most of the time? What magazine would that be?

I am going to read you a short list of places and ask you to tell me how many times you visited each type of place during the last year, that is, the last 12 months. If you did not visit any given place, just say none.

–A natural history museum?

–A zoo or an aquarium?

–A science or technology museum?

–A public library?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-50.

Visitors of science or technology museums one or more times per year: 1983–2001

Characteristic	1983	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent									
All adults	61	58	59	59	62	61	60	61	66
Male	62	58	57	59	60	59	63	63	64
Female	60	57	61	60	63	63	58	60	68
Formal education									
Less than high school	43	37	36	30	40	32	34	37	54
High school graduate	63	61	64	66	64	64	64	63	64
Baccalaureate degree	78	78	80	79	78	80	78	83	81
Graduate/professional degree	83	79	81	76	78	83	75	79	83
Attentiveness to science or technology^a									
Attentive public	72	70	61	69	67	71	68	73	75
Interested public	66	60	63	60	61	65	66	67	68
Residual public	51	53	56	57	61	54	51	52	62
Sample size (number)									
All adults	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	775	950	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	856	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	404	507	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	941	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	282	349	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	208	235	233	229	105	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-51.
Readers of science fiction books or magazines: 2001
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	Read		Frequency of reading		Sample size (number)
	No	Yes	Regularly	Once in a while	
All adults	70	30	16	84	1,574
Male	69	31	16	84	751
Female	72	28	17	83	823
Formal education					
Less than high school	77	23	7	93	116
High school graduate	71	29	19	81	834
Baccalaureate degree	65	35	13	87	393
Graduate/professional degree	65	35	14	86	221
Science/mathematics education^a					
Low	77	23	18	82	674
Middle	67	33	10	90	469
High	57	43	20	80	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b					
Attentive public	63	37	28	72	195
Interested public	66	34	17	83	755
Residual public	77	23	10	90	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a "high" level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as "middle" if they took six to eight such courses and "low" if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-52.

Viewers of Star Trek and X-Files: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	Star Trek			X-Files			Sample size (number)
	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	Regularly	Occasionally	Not at all	
All adults	11	21	68	15	28	57	1,574
Male	12	23	64	15	30	55	751
Female	10	18	72	14	27	59	823
Formal education							
Less than high school	11	16	73	17	29	54	116
High school graduate	11	21	68	15	30	55	834
Baccalaureate degree	11	25	64	16	22	62	393
Graduate/professional degree	8	20	71	7	27	66	221
Science/mathematics education^a							
Low	13	18	69	17	27	55	674
Middle	8	23	69	11	28	59	469
High	11	23	66	15	30	57	431
Attentiveness to science and technology^b							
Attentive public	14	22	64	15	32	53	195
Interested public	14	21	64	19	30	51	755
Residual public	6	19	74	10	26	64	624

^aRespondents were classified as having a “high” level of science/mathematics education if they took nine or more high school and college science/math courses. They were classified as “middle” if they took six to eight such courses and “low” if they took five or fewer.

^bTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-53.

Public assessment of astrology: 1979–2001

Characteristic	1979	1981	1985	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent										
All adults										
Very scientific	7	10	8	6	6	6	7	7	7	9
Sort of scientific	34	35	31	31	29	29	28	29	29	31
Not at all scientific	50	51	57	60	60	62	60	59	59	56
Do not know	9	4	4	3	5	3	5	5	5	4
Male										
Very scientific	7	9	7	5	5	6	7	7	7	9
Sort of scientific	30	29	29	25	23	25	24	27	25	27
Not at all scientific	54	58	60	67	67	67	65	63	63	60
Do not know	9	4	4	3	5	2	4	3	5	3
Female										
Very scientific	8	10	9	7	6	7	7	7	7	8
Sort of scientific	37	41	32	37	35	32	32	31	32	36
Not at all scientific	46	44	55	53	55	58	55	55	56	52
Do not know	9	5	4	3	4	3	6	7	5	4
Less than high school graduate										
Very scientific	11	13	14	11	7	12	11	11	13	14
Sort of scientific	34	37	38	35	31	33	28	37	34	35
Not at all scientific	39	40	43	50	50	49	48	42	41	45
Do not know	16	10	5	4	12	6	13	10	12	6
High school graduate										
Very scientific	7	10	8	6	6	6	8	7	7	9
Sort of scientific	37	38	29	32	32	31	30	30	30	35
Not at all scientific	50	50	60	59	60	61	59	59	60	52
Do not know	6	2	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	4
Baccalaureate and higher										
Very scientific	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	4
Sort of scientific	20	25	25	23	18	17	22	19	19	21
Not at all scientific	71	69	70	74	77	78	74	76	76	74
Do not know	7	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2
Attentive public to science and technology^a										
Very scientific	8	9	7	3	6	15	8	7	12	4
Sort of scientific	28	34	27	29	21	23	24	29	23	25
Not at all scientific	60	54	62	66	72	58	65	62	64	68
Do not know	4	3	4	2	1	4	3	2	1	2
Sample size (number)										
All adults	1,635	1,631	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	773	775	950	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	862	856	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	465	404	507	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	932	941	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	238	282	349	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	154	208	235	233	229	105	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: Would you say that astrology is very scientific, sort of scientific, or not at all scientific?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, various years.

See figure 7-21 in Volume 1.

Science & Engineering Indicators – 2002

Appendix table 7-54.

Frequency of reading astrology reports, by selected characteristics: 1985–2001

Characteristic	1985	1988	1990	1992	1997	1999	2001
Percent							
All adults							
Every day	9	9	9	8	7	6	7
Quite often	6	8	8	7	8	6	8
Just occasionally	37	33	33	35	33	32	30
Almost never	13	13	12	13	12	17	18
Never	35	37	38	37	38	39	38
Do not know	*	0	0	0	2	*	*
Male							
Every day	8	6	5	6	3	4	4
Quite often	5	4	4	6	6	4	7
Just occasionally	30	30	29	29	32	26	23
Almost never	14	15	14	14	13	18	20
Never	43	45	48	45	44	48	46
Do not know	*	0	0	0	2	0	0
Female							
Every day	10	13	12	10	10	7	10
Quite often	6	11	11	9	9	7	8
Just occasionally	44	37	37	40	35	37	36
Almost never	12	10	11	12	11	16	16
Never	27	29	29	29	33	33	30
Do not know	*	0	0	0	2	*	*
Less than high school graduate							
Every day	11	13	13	10	11	11	9
Quite often	7	8	7	9	8	7	7
Just occasionally	31	28	28	35	32	26	26
Almost never	11	10	9	14	6	15	19
Never	39	41	43	32	43	41	39
Do not know	*	0	0	0	*	*	0
High school graduate							
Every day	10	8	9	9	7	5	7
Quite often	5	9	8	8	9	6	9
Just occasionally	40	36	36	37	35	34	32
Almost never	13	13	12	11	13	17	16
Never	32	35	35	35	34	38	35
Do not know	*	0	0	0	2	0	*
Baccalaureate and higher							
Every day	5	6	4	5	4	3	4
Quite often	5	5	6	4	4	4	4
Just occasionally	37	33	30	29	29	30	27
Almost never	16	16	18	16	15	20	22
Never	36	40	42	46	44	43	43
Do not know	*	0	0	0	4	0	0
Attentive public to science and technology^a							
Every day	12	17	13	15	13	7	14
Quite often	6	8	5	4	9	3	8
Just occasionally	33	30	38	27	30	33	26
Almost never	13	11	10	11	12	16	13
Never	36	34	34	43	32	41	40
Do not know	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Sample size (number)							
All adults	2,005	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	950	958	964	486	930	900	751
Female	1,054	1,084	1,070	533	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	507	530	495	215	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,147	1,158	1,202	623	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	349	353	336	203	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	235	233	229	105	288	216	195

See explanatory notes, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

Appendix table 7-54.

Frequency of reading astrology reports, by selected characteristics: 1985–2001

* = <.5

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following questions:

–Do you ever read a horoscope or your personal astrology report?

–(If yes:) Do you read an astrology report every day, quite often, just occasionally, or almost never?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-55.

Belief in psychic powers or extrasensory perception, by selected characteristics: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	7
Agree	53
Do not know	4
Disagree	29
Strongly disagree	7
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	7
Agree	47
Do not know	4
Disagree	34
Strongly disagree	7
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	7
Agree	58
Do not know	4
Disagree	25
Strongly disagree	6
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	42
Do not know	4
Disagree	41
Strongly disagree	9
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	8
Agree	57
Do not know	3
Disagree	26
Strongly disagree	8
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	8
Agree	52
Do not know	5
Disagree	29
Strongly disagree	5
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	10
Agree	49
Do not know	4
Disagree	29
Strongly disagree	8

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Responses are to the following statement: Some people possess psychic powers or ESP. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-56.

Belief that unidentified flying objects are space vehicles from other civilizations: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	27
Do not know	13
Disagree	45
Strongly disagree	12
Male (number = 751)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	25
Do not know	12
Disagree	46
Strongly disagree	13
Female (number = 823)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	28
Do not know	14
Disagree	45
Strongly disagree	11
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	4
Agree	28
Do not know	10
Disagree	48
Strongly disagree	11
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	28
Do not know	13
Disagree	44
Strongly disagree	12
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	22
Do not know	16
Disagree	48
Strongly disagree	12
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	3
Agree	33
Do not know	13
Disagree	36
Strongly disagree	15

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. Responses are to the following statement: Some of the unidentified flying objects that have been reported are really space vehicles from other civilizations. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-57.

Belief in lucky numbers, by selected characteristics: 1988–2001

Characteristic	1988	1990	1992	1995	1997	1999	2001
Percent							
All adults							
Strongly agree	1	2	3	2	2	3	3
Agree	35	33	33	35	34	31	29
Do not know	5	4	3	4	5	3	4
Disagree	51	51	50	48	46	51	53
Strongly disagree	8	10	11	11	13	12	11
Male							
Strongly agree	2	2	4	3	2	4	3
Agree	35	31	33	34	33	30	30
Do not know	4	3	3	3	5	2	3
Disagree	50	52	48	48	46	51	52
Strongly disagree	9	12	12	12	14	13	13
Female							
Strongly agree	1	2	2	2	2	3	3
Agree	36	36	34	37	36	32	29
Do not know	5	5	3	4	5	4	5
Disagree	52	50	52	48	45	51	54
Strongly disagree	6	7	9	9	12	10	10
Less than high school graduate							
Strongly agree	1	2	7	3	4	7	3
Agree	47	46	43	46	43	39	48
Do not know	7	6	5	6	8	4	4
Disagree	43	44	40	41	33	44	40
Strongly disagree	2	2	5	4	12	6	6
High school graduate							
Strongly agree	2	3	3	3	2	2	3
Agree	34	33	35	37	36	33	27
Do not know	3	3	2	3	4	3	4
Disagree	54	52	51	48	48	52	56
Strongly disagree	7	9	9	9	10	10	10
Baccalaureate and higher							
Strongly agree	1	1	0	1	2	1	2
Agree	23	16	18	20	20	21	20
Do not know	5	4	4	4	5	3	4
Disagree	53	59	57	55	52	52	56
Strongly disagree	18	20	21	20	21	23	18
Attentive public to science and technology^a							
Strongly agree	2	2	5	6	5	6	4
Agree	36	28	32	25	29	27	30
Do not know	4	5	4	3	6	2	4
Disagree	45	51	44	48	42	45	50
Strongly disagree	13	14	15	18	18	20	13
Sample size (number)							
All adults	2,041	2,033	1,004	2,006	2,000	1,882	1,574
Male	958	964	486	953	930	900	751
Female	1,084	1,070	533	1,053	1,070	982	823
Less than high school graduate	530	495	215	418	420	403	116
High school graduate	1,158	1,202	623	1,196	1,188	1,111	834
Baccalaureate and higher	353	336	203	392	392	368	614
Attentive public to science and technology	233	229	105	195	288	216	195

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is “very interested” in that issue, is “very well informed” about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are “very interested” in an issue area but do not think that they are “very well informed” about it are classified as the “interested public.” All other individuals are classified as members of the “residual public” for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statement:

Some numbers are especially lucky for some people. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-58.

Belief in alternative medicine, by selected characteristics: 2001
(Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number= 1,574)	
Strongly agree	18
Agree	70
Do not know	3
Disagree	7
Strongly disagree	1
Male (number= 751)	
Strongly agree	18
Agree	72
Do not know	3
Disagree	6
Strongly disagree	1
Female (number= 823)	
Strongly agree	19
Agree	69
Do not know	4
Disagree	8
Strongly disagree	1
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Strongly agree	15
Agree	68
Do not know	5
Disagree	11
Strongly disagree	1
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Strongly agree	18
Agree	71
Do not know	4
Disagree	7
Strongly disagree	1
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Strongly agree	20
Agree	72
Do not know	1
Disagree	5
Strongly disagree	1
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Strongly agree	21
Agree	68
Do not know	2
Disagree	7
Strongly disagree	3

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTES: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following statement: There are some good ways of treating sickness that medical science does not recognize. Do you strongly agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.

Appendix table 7-59.
**Public assessment of magnetic therapy, by
 selected characteristics: 2001**
 (Percentages)

Characteristic	2001
All adults (number = 1,574)	
Very scientific	14
Sort of scientific	54
Not at all scientific	25
Do not know	7
Male (number = 751)	
Very scientific	14
Sort of scientific	51
Not at all scientific	28
Do not know	6
Female (number = 823)	
Very scientific	14
Sort of scientific	56
Not at all scientific	22
Do not know	8
Less than high school graduate (number = 116)	
Very scientific	30
Sort of scientific	47
Not at all scientific	18
Do not know	5
High school graduate (number = 834)	
Very scientific	13
Sort of scientific	58
Not at all scientific	22
Do not know	6
Baccalaureate and higher (number = 614)	
Very scientific	8
Sort of scientific	47
Not at all scientific	35
Do not know	10
Attentive public to science and technology^a (number = 195)	
Very scientific	14
Sort of scientific	47
Not at all scientific	34
Do not know	5

^aTo be classified as attentive to a given policy area, an individual must indicate that he or she is "very interested" in that issue, is "very well informed" about it, and a regular reader of a daily newspaper or relevant national magazine. Individuals who report that they are "very interested" in an issue area but do not think that they are "very well informed" about it are classified as the "interested public." All other individuals are classified as members of the "residual public" for that issue. The attentive public for science and technology combines the attentive public for new scientific discoveries and the attentive public for new inventions and technologies. Any individual who is not attentive to either of those issues but who is a member of the interested public for at least one of those issues is classified as a member of the interested public for science and technology. All other individuals are classified as members of the residual public for science and technology.

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. A few respondents did not provide information about their highest level of education. Responses are to the following question: Based on what you've read or heard, would you say that magnetic therapy is very scientific, sort of scientific, or not at all scientific?

SOURCE: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics (NSF/SRS), NSF Survey of Public Attitudes Toward and Understanding of Science and Technology, 2001.